UNDERSTANDING THE SOCIAL EXCLUSION OF ZIMBABWEAN MIGRANTS IN JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA

Chipo HUNGWE[1]

Derik GELDERBLOM[2]

Abstract: *This paper applies the social exclusion concept to understanding the experiences of Zimbabwean migrants in Johannesburg, South Africa. It argues that the experiences of Zimbabwean migrants are shaped by certain institutional, individual and social mechanisms of exclusion. The main institutions responsible for migrant exclusion are: the police; hospitals, banks and employers. The paper further argues that migrant social networks mainly used to deal with exclusion have unwittingly made it difficult for migrants to be integrated properly within the South African society. This is because migrant networks emphasise values of exclusivity and difference. The paper proffers a pragmatic view of understanding migrants as citizens of a global world. It maintains that the social exclusion of migrants must be understood from a cosmopolitan and global perspective.*

Keywords: *Banks; Hospitals; Migrants; Police; Social exclusion.*

1. Introduction

The concept of social exclusion has been used in relation to people belonging to the same nation. European studies of social exclusion have taken this stance in studying multiple levels of deprivation and weakening social bonds among different groups of a nation. However, there are studies that have attempted to use the concept of social exclusion to understand migrants in 'foreign countries'. This paper contributes to the growing literature on the social exclusion of migrants. This approach to studying migrants is crucial for various reasons; there are growing numbers of migrants in almost every country now, these migrants do not seem eager to return to their countries - some are applying for citizenship in their host countries, the economic recession and global restructuring processes taking place are affecting rates of employment and

[1] PhD, Senior lecturer and Chairperson in the department of Human Resource Management at the Midlands State University in Gweru, Zimbabwe. Email: hungwec@msu.ac.zw

[2] Professor in the department of Sociology at the University of South Africa in Pretoria. Email: gelded@unisa.ac.za

poverty and globally there are increasing levels of xenophobia. At the same time, there has been a growth of the influence of supra-national bodies that are raising awareness regarding the rights of migrants. All these factors have a bearing on the extent to which migrants can be integrated, thus raising the need to understand the possible processes of social exclusion of migrants who are ordinarily viewed as economic liabilities and outsiders.

This study broadens the concept of social exclusion to understanding migrants as citizens of the global world. In this view, we make use of the concept of cosmopolitanism which explains migration as one of the consequences of globalisation. The international bodies such as the United Nations and the International Labour Organisation have also come up with legal instruments (for example, the United Nations Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their families (1990), which define the rights of migrant workers and human beings in a broader perspective that transcends national boundaries. This sets the scene for the understanding of social exclusion from a global perspective.

In conceptualizing the social exclusion of Zimbabweans the paper raises five main arguments: (a) social exclusion is about competition and distribution of scarce resources, (b) it is about lack of social cohesion and bonds, (c) it is about disadvantaged participation, or inclusion on unfavourable terms, of members belonging to devalued groups. Social exclusion is about inequality and having a devalued identity, (d) the Zimbabwean identity is a devalued identity. This explains why some migrants are motivated to quickly shed it off or conceal it and (e) social exclusion is facilitated by activities of individuals and institutional processes. These are agents of social exclusion.

1.1. Research participants, methods and setting

The research involved fifty eight (58) migrants; both documented and undocumented, who had been in South Africa for more than six months on a continuous basis. The migrants studied specifically lived in Kempton Park and Tembisa areas that are approximately 25km north-east of Johannesburg central. Research methods used were mainly semi structured and in-depth life history interviews based on a sample that was purposively selected. These were supplemented by moments of participant observation by the researchers as one of the researchers stayed with the participants for the duration of the study. The research was based on life history interviews/narratives and participant observation. Life history interviews are geared towards understanding the migrants' whole life course (Van Nieuwenhuyze 2009). The use of the word narratives here is to emphasise the focus on how migrants create 'their stories' in explaining their life courses. In order to adhere to proper ethical standards pseudonyms are used to refer to migrants in the study.

The sampling methods were purposive as attempts were made to approach knowledgeable individuals such as those who had been in Tembisa for a long period of time (for example, more than 10 years) or those with special circumstances such as being entrepreneurs, or those who had successfully changed their identities and citizenship to South Africa through naturalisation and other methods. This was a deliberate strategy to involve 'information rich' individuals. The other deliberate

purpose was including as many different men and women as possible to achieve heterogeneity. The gender ratio was maintained such that eventually there were 25 females and 33 males (1:1,3) that participated in the study. This roughly corresponds to the male- female ratio of migrants in Johannesburg.

2. Literature review

The term social exclusion gained currency in the late 1960s and early 1970s when most European countries were dealing with the crisis of the welfare state, high unemployment and slow economic growth. It is mostly associated with the French policy maker Rene Lenoir who in 1974 discovered that a large number of people, almost a tenth of the population, were not protected by social security (Atkinson 1998; Percy-Smith 2000; Saith 2001; Lelkes 2006). These were the 'excluded' ones. Daly and Silver (2008) contend that social exclusion can be traced to French republicanism, social Catholicism and social democracy. They further argue that "the influence of democratic and social catholic thought is to be seen in the concept's interest in respectively, redistributive state policies and the strength of familial groups and social ties and obligations" (Daly and Silver 2008:541). In sociological studies, social exclusion is mainly founded on the ideas of Emile Durkheim concerning social solidarity and Max Weber concerning status groups and social closure (Silver 1994; Levitas, Pantoras, Fahmy, Gordon, Lloyd and Patsios 2007). Social exclusion is both about social bonds or social cohesion (relational social exclusion) and also about distributional injustice and lack of access to resources (Room 1999; Kabeer 2000; Sen 2000).

2.1. The agents of social exclusion

Social exclusion is a process that is facilitated by individuals and institutions such as the employers, banks, hospitals and government departments. Atkinson (1998:14) argues that:

> "Exclusion implies an act with an agent or agents. People may exclude themselves in that they drop out of the market economy or they may be excluded by the decisions of banks who do not give credit, or insurance companies who will not provide cover.... In terms of failure to achieve the status of inclusion, we may be concerned not just with the person's situation, but also the extent to which he or she is responsible".

Certain individuals may exercise their agency and voluntarily exclude themselves from others. This is called social isolation (Barry 1998). Bonacich (1973) highlighted how migrants contributed to their exclusion by the host population through their own 'sojourner' and 'stranger orientation' and general ambivalence towards their hosts. This ambivalence was perpetuated by migrant networks.

However, Barry (1998) cautions that what may be deemed as voluntary isolation may sometimes be a reaction to experiences of discrimination and hostility. In such a situation while the act of withdrawal is voluntary the context does not offer an individual much choice thus socially excluding them. Atkinson (1998) and Kabeer

(2000) further highlight that social exclusion entails discrimination and unfavourable inclusion.

2.2. The different forms of social exclusion

Silver (1995:58) identifies three types of exclusion: exclusion from the labour market reflected by long term unemployment and difficulty of initial entry into the labour market; exclusion from regular work which is reflected through the growing rates of precarious work and part time employment; and exclusion from decent housing and community services. Silver (1995) reiterates that exclusion from the labour market may be either through unemployment or through a situation where one is included in the labour market but is trapped in a "bad" job because of the segmentation of the labour market characterised by easy access to "bad" jobs and difficult access to good jobs due to such variables as gender, race or nationality. Zimbabwean migrants fall within the first and second categories where they are included in the labour market through participation in "bad" jobs especially in the service industry where they work as waiters and waitresses, shop assistants, domestic workers and security guards.

2.3. Understanding social exclusion from a global perspective

The social exclusion of migrants must be understood from the perspective of the world as a global society by acknowledging processes of globalisation and its effect of creating cosmopolitan societies. This discussion stems from the reality that in every nation state, there are increasing numbers of people who are not nationals (defined as strangers) who work and spend their lives there. The major question therefore, is: how can these people be incorporated or integrated so that they participate meaningfully in the social life of countries where they find themselves in? Migration is a feature of globalisation and global inequality such that with the intensification of these two processes, we can expect an increase in migration. Therefore since immigration is inescapable, there is a need to find ways of meaningful co-operation and integration with migrants. According to Beck (2000) we now live in cosmopolitan societies that are characterised by some high mobility, dual citizenship and high transnational activities. Beck (2000) argues that in cosmopolitan societies social exclusion happens to individuals defined as strangers/non-equals – by virtues of not belonging to the nation. A solution to social exclusion of these 'strangers' is to appeal to social solidarity that stems from the recognition of universal human rights. Social solidarity in such cases is the solidarity of strangers, rather than the solidarity of equals (ibid: 93). Therefore the participation of migrants in the social life of their host communities is on the basis of universal and international human rights.

In light of the foregoing, we combine the arguments of Levitas, Pantoras, Fahmy, Lloyd and Patsios (2007) and Kabeer (2000), to define social exclusion of migrants as: lack of, denial or inadequate access to resources, goods and services and the inability to participate in the common activities of the host community, facilitated by certain institutional rules, processes and mechanisms and also activities of other individuals.

Understanding how migrants (whether documented or not) are excluded gives an insight into issues of discrimination, social integration, cohesion, xenophobia and even

racism. Social exclusion affects their quality of life (Levitas et al 2007). These migrants are at risk of exclusion and even violence because they are usually seen as taking 'away' jobs from the locals (Sen 2000; Cholewinski 2005; Kalitanyi and Visser 2010). Sen (2000: 20) discusses active social exclusion of migrants where governments may, through certain policies, deliberately exclude migrants from participating in the economic and political activities of their communities. An example is where governments may delay the process of acquiring citizenship for foreigners such that they are excluded from voting.

3. Discussion

The following are identified as agents of social exclusion of Zimbabwean migrants in South Africa: the government through its economic policies such as the BBBEE; employers; banks; police; hospitals; schools; South African locals, especially landlords; churches and Zimbabweans themselves through tribalism and regionalism. These factors are discussed one by one in the sections to follow.

3.1. Government policies

The Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment Act (BBBEE) of 2003

Among the aims of the BBBEE of 2003 are to promote black economic empowerment in a bid to de-racialise the white dominated economy and promote the participation of black people in the economy through entrepreneurship and occupation of all levels of management. The black people are defined as Africans, coloureds and Indians. The BBBEE Amendment Bill of November 2012 further defines these black as "citizens of the Republic of South Africa by birth or descent or (those) who became citizens of the Republic of South Africa by naturalisation before 27 April 1994". The provisions of this policy make it impossible for migrant entrepreneurs to benefit from state support on the basis of Black Economic Empowerment. Since most black migrants went to South Africa after 1994 at the end of apartheid, it is impossible for them to have attained citizenship then. Zimbabwean entrepreneurs cannot benefit from BBBEE Act provisions. The businesses of Zimbabwean migrant entrepreneurs are potential sources of employment which could even benefit local South Africans, if they have adequate financial support.

The macro economic and political environment is designed by the state as it defines who is welcome to enter through its immigration laws. It also determines who participates in the labour market by labour laws that afford more rights to certain individuals. When a state openly and elaborately puts in place laws that make it difficult for foreigners to participate in the labour market it is essentially telling them that they have no part to play. The Immigration Act is making it more and more difficult to employ even skilled migrants because South African employers must demonstrate their inability to get such skills locally. Not only that, but the South African government has gone on to provide incentives for hiring local South Africans citizens through its Black Empowerment Policy and Employment Equity provisions. These are laudable moves for correcting past injustices to the black South Africans. However, this does not

change the fact that the situation of foreigners becomes even more desperate as they find it difficult to participate in the formal labour market. The macro economic and political environment narrows their structure of opportunity and may unintentionally channel them towards illegitimate means of survival.

3.1.1. Legal limbo

From September 2010 to December 2010, the South African government implemented the Zimbabwe Documentation Project where qualifying Zimbabweans were invited to apply for legal documents such as the general work permit and the business permit. The purpose of the process was to enumerate Zimbabweans in the country while encouraging them to legalise their stay; at the same time relieving the asylum system which was being overwhelmed by Zimbabwean migrant applicants. Although the Zimbabwe Documentation project (ZDP) was meant to increase the number of legal migrants in the country, it has created another monster. The process has created a new group of migrants that are in limbo - they are neither legal nor illegal - at least in the eyes of the police and it is up to them to define legality on the streets. In the same process, migrants were encouraged to surrender their asylum and fake identity documents to government officials. Some migrants surrendered their fake identity books and asylum documents with the hope that general work permits would be easily available. However, up to now, some still do not have permits though they have their passports. They have receipts showing that they applied for permits. To that extent therefore, their legality depends on the government officials' interpretation of the migrant's situation.

3.2. Banks and social exclusion

Banks adhere to international anti-laundering and anti terrorism policies that require that they have full details of potential clients such as housing and employment details. However, these requirements expose migrants to social exclusion where some employers refuse to write letters as proof of employment or where house-owners refuse to provide the needed proof of residence. The inability to access banking facilities is related to what Atkinson (1998) refers to as social exclusion in consumption. Migrants whose legality is questionable have no access to banking facilities. This is in line with the international banking laws. However, even those that have the necessary documents may not fully enjoy banking facilities.

There was one person (Tendai), whose money can be described as being 'trapped' in a bank. He was allowed to open a bank account using an asylum permit but after surrendering the asylum documents in order to apply for a general permit, he no longer has anything to identify himself with at the bank except for his application for permit receipt and passport. He is still waiting for the adjudication results on his application for a general work permit. In the mean time, he cannot access his funds because his account was 'frozen' and since the bank officials insisted that he produces a valid work permit. This means that he may languish in poverty while his money is in a 'frozen account' that cannot be withdrawn. This is another form of social exclusion that Zimbabwean migrants face. The questions to ask for such cases are: will the account

remain open or will it eventually close? Will the account earn interest and if so, will the migrant have access to it?

3.2.1. *Access to bank loans*

> "Some banks ask for permanent residence if you don't have a green book. If you want to buy a house they will ask you to raise 60-90% cash. I tried and they said I should raise 60%. I wanted to buy a house. I gave up. I will raise the full amount by myself. Everything that I have I bought for cash including the car parked outside" (Vongai).

> "I tried getting a loan to buy a car and they said because I am a foreigner on a work permit they couldn't give me. It's discrimination. The thing is; you are working in South Africa that's where your life is, you cannot get the facilities that everyone else gets. That we can't get opportunities to buy cars and other goods on credit s pulling us down" (Trish).

Lack of access to loans also means that migrants may have difficulties buying durable goods and even cars since they have to pay cash for everything. While some migrants are enjoying access to credit facilities on clothes, they do not have the same access when it comes to buying bigger material goods such as stoves, refrigerators and cars. They thus mostly remain property-less. Those that have had access to loans of any kind are those that use fake South African identity books. To some extent, therefore, the banking requirements may lead to deviant behaviour on the part of migrants who end up faking identity in order to benefit from bank facilities.

3.3. Employers and social exclusion

Documented migrants still face exclusion and discrimination in the labour market as a result of employment practices and the creation of irregular jobs. The employment environment is also riddled with discrimination and xenophobia where some local South Africans will approach migrants telling them point blank (like what happened to Alex) that "if it was not for you my son would be occupying this same position that you have", even if in reality the son is not as qualified as the migrant. Exclusion at the workplace happens through poor quality jobs, underpayment (includes long working hours without commensurate payment), not having a contract (thus not knowing what one works for and for how long), non provision of benefits (including non provision of protective clothing and generally proper tools for use in the execution of a task) and sometimes outright non-payment (when the employer reports the employee to the police).

Atkinson (1998:18) provides three conditions that must be satisfied for employment to end social exclusion. These are: the job must restore a sense of control, an individual must have an acceptable status relative to others and there must be future prospects provided by the job. This means that if the current job of the migrant does not provide a sense of control, a relative status and future development; it may not reduce the social exclusion of the incumbent. Most Zimbabwean migrants occupy insecure low status jobs that have no future prospects. They are not even guaranteed of working in the same jobs in the future. To some extent, therefore, they cannot have any long term

plans because they have no idea what the future would be. They live in the present as the future is not guaranteed. Employers benefit from such unclear situations.

Among the research participants was Tendai who was given a fake South African identity book by his employer. He claims that this is what the employer does to every new migrant recruit. He argues:

> "I don't even know whose identity book I am using. I was just given by the manager. I don't know where he gets these identity books. He does that (giving identity books) to migrants. He gives migrants identity books...but I can't be permanent because I use someone's South African identity book".

While this practice may give the job seeker a wage at the end of the month, the job is impermanent and has no benefits at all. The jobholder has no sense of control and security. They may be constantly reminded of their illegality, as a means of keeping them in check. This provides room for abuse of employees by employers. The employers tap on the vulnerability of migrants, knowing that they have no recourse to the law (for the undocumented migrants) or are afraid to jeopardise their job through legal battles (for the documented migrants).

3.4. The police as a source of social exclusion

According to Kabeer (2000) social exclusion is a product of processes of interaction. Social exclusion by the police is created by the way they interact with migrants. Therefore social exclusion is an everyday product of how the police deal with migrants. Vigneswaran (2012) views the South African Police (SAPS) as generally insensitive, violent, abusive and corrupt in dealing with migrants. The following ways of exclusion are discussed in relation to the police; public embarrassment and name calling, soliciting for bribes and lack of protection for migrants.

Although the police have no monopoly over the use of the stigmatising name *makwerekwere*, they have used it in dealing with foreigners. This negative labelling stigmatises and devalues all migrants regardless of whether they are documented or not. All foreigners are *makwerekwere* (babblers, people whose languages are not understandable). It also limits their freedom to engage in social activities as migrants become too self conscious and fear being conspicuous. Devaluing migrants in such ways make them be viewed as undeserving humane treatment. Reidpath, Chan, Gifford and Allotey (2005) concur that negative labelling leads to stigmatisation and devaluing of individuals. Being called *makwerekwere* has the effect of setting the foreigners apart, as the 'others'. Such defamation has led to xenophobic attacks and murders of foreigners in general and Zimbabweans in particular, especially in the poor areas of Johannesburg (Morris 1998; Sinclair 1999; Monson and Misago 2009, Landau and Freemantle 2010; Hungwe 2012). Mai (2005) observed the same processes of stigmatisation of Albanian migrants in Italy who were referred to as 'shitty' Albanese.

There is rampant corruption in so far as migrants are concerned, such that Vigneswaran, Araia, Hoag and Tshabalala (2010) argue that there is informal immigration law enforcement. They further went on to argue how such informality weakens state power. One migrant, Norbert argued that:

> "The police are a problem with or without identity documents. If they want a bribe they will tell you that your identity documents are fake. Because you would be desperate and cannot afford to spend a night in police cells, you just give them a bribe and go away. The bribe can be R100 or R200... My friend was put in a cell and he paid R1000 to get out after 7 days.....These days police do not deport you, they just put you in detention until you can pay the bribe".

The police officers' love for bribes is also reflected in Worby (2010) who highlights how Zimbabwean migrants in Johannesburg central have adjusted their lifestyles to avoid police by limiting their activities in the city centre or by changing the times that they are seen outdoors. Police seem to be notoriously busy during their lunch hour in Johannesburg central (ibid: 2010). By dominating the public spaces police eventually force migrants into hiding where they live in fear. This does not only refer to undocumented migrants, but to documented migrants too who will tend to avoid certain areas for fear of being embarrassed by the police demanding identity books where police institute 'border performances' at any given public place and time. This increases the internalisation of the security gaze such that migrants end up policing themselves (McDowell and Wonders 2010).

There were cases of harassment reported by migrants. There was a common perception that the police were always after bribes and were not genuinely carrying out their duties as government officials. One female migrant called Trish (an accountant) described how she was harassed by a group of policemen:

> "They asked for my passport. I gave them a photocopy because I don't move around with my original copy. I am scared that if I lose it that's the end of my life. They shouted at me saying; you come in this country and you want to change the laws. They said they will put me in prison because I have no documents. So I said take me to the police station. They said I was being rude to them. They gathered around me. They were about ten men against one woman. They shouted at me telling me to go back to Robert Mugabe. I told them that I am not a thief and the fact that I am a foreigner doesn't mean I am a thief. I responded because they were abusing me. The more I responded the more they got frustrated and one of them wanted to hit me but another policeman said this is a woman leave her alone...My policy is that I don't pay them bribes. They were being difficult because I did not offer them money".

The main conclusion that can be drawn from this row between the police and the female migrant is the connection that was drawn between migrants and their political leaders. This is an exclusionary tactic where that identity serves to distinguish the migrant as different or 'belonging elsewhere'. This is so rampant in many government offices where if one is known to be from Zimbabwe he/she is immediately asked questions such as: How is Mugabe? How is Tsvangirai? Do you still want Mugabe to rule your country? Such questions are interpreted as patronising. To make matters worse, the questioning is done in public and in a sneering, mocking way.

Reference to political leaders is a position marker which sets the migrant apart. The same practice happens in hospitals where nurses tell Zimbabwean female migrants in

labour to go back to Mugabe and scream there (see the discussion of hospitals as agents of exclusion). This increases the extent of social exclusion because, in some cases, the migrants themselves are not big fans of their political leaders; especially so where their reasons for leaving the country in the first place are linked to their perceptions of the same political leaders having failed them. Their migration was to some extent their way of expressing a vote of no confidence in the same leaders, thus they were voting with their feet (Gaidzanwa 1997).

3.5. Hospitals as institutions of social exclusion

Hospitals have been viewed as institutions that tend to exclude migrants (Crush and Tawodzera 2011) especially for holders of foreign documents. Migrants argued that nurses would angrily claim that they do not know what an asylum is. Mary went to a public hospital twice. The first time she was received well. The second time:

> "...the nurse asked: What is an asylum? They (nurses) started talking about Tsvangirai. They talked to me in Pedi. They said I am rude and they threatened me saying since I am going to theatre I should behave myself. They were really discriminatory".

Migrants highlighted that they were shouted at while being attended, denied medicines or sometimes the nurses did not create a personal file for them. This meant that each time they went there they were treated as new patients, without a treatment record or history. That jeopardized their chances of getting good treatment. Dorothy was a high school teacher in Tembisa. She narrated how she was treated when she sought medical attention at a local clinic:

> "the treatment was ok, but the nurses told me that they don't create a file (for medical history) for foreigners because it's against the law. If you don't have a medical history it's difficult to be treated well. But I know of other foreigners who have files...I didn't complain because in the end they will chase you".

Perceptions of ill-treatment could be justified by the percentages of those that use private doctors (31%) and those who neither go to hospitals nor private doctors (17,2%). Among those that do not go to hospitals were individuals who said that if they were sick they would just go and buy medicines they thought would heal them. Alternatively, they would go and describe their symptoms to a pharmacist and get medicines over the counter. These seemed to be of much help. The preference for expensive private doctors might not be evidence of wealth but the fear of being negatively discriminated against, in government clinics and hospitals.

Migrants were easily identified and stigmatised by their inability to speak local languages. Nurses address migrants in local languages like Pedi, Xhosa and Zulu and the moment an individual expressed inability to speak these languages (by preferring to speak in English) they became targets of abuse and insults. Vivienne explained:

> "They like to speak their own languages. Someone would speak to you in Venda and you can't continue with your English. They will tell you that there are 11 official languages in South Africa".

Women migrants are more socially excluded than men when it comes to hospitals which they naturally frequent by virtue of their reproductive roles. Female migrants complained of second class treatment in public hospitals. Nurses engage in unruly practices when they shout "go back and scream in Zimbabwe" or when they create their own smaller policies of 'one woman, one child' as exemplified by the following quotation from Vongai:

> "When I gave birth in Hillbrow the nurses were quite horrible. They were shouting; you foreigners, you Zimbabweans, go back to your country. Why do you come here to have babies? You are wasting our resources..."

Contrary to claims by some government officials and South African locals, Zimbabwean migrants under study do not have many babies. Table 1 depicts the number of children migrants had. Twenty four percent (24%) of the migrants did not have any children, while 67,2% had between one and three children. Only 8,6% had more than three children. These tended to be over the age of forty and their children mostly stayed with relatives in Zimbabwe.

Table 1. Number of children

Number of children	Frequency	Percent
no children	14	24.1
between 1 and 3	39	67.2
more than three children	5	8.6
Total	58	100

Source: authors' fieldwork

There were few migrants who stayed with their children in Johannesburg. This was a result of two main issues: the limited space for accommodation (as migrants mostly stay in single rooms) and the migrants' evaluation of the quality of education in South Africa. Again, life was generally deemed to be very expensive in South Africa. That is why they preferred sending the children back to Zimbabwe rather than actually staying with them. The other reason was fact that children of undocumented mothers cannot access birth certificates in South Africa. When they want the child to acquire a birth certificate, they will send the child back to Zimbabwe where it is easy to acquire one. The child ends up learning in Zimbabwe.

3.6. Taxis and trains vehicles of social exclusion

Individuals may be socially excluded if they feel they cannot fully participate even in taxis and public transport. The inability to speak *Shona* and *Ndebele* (Zimbabwean local languages) while in a taxi or train reveals the extent to which Zimbabwean migrants are not free to express themselves. This applies to both the legal and illegal migrants. When they receive phone calls from relatives speaking in their vernacular they usually switch off their phones or pretend not to understand until the caller eventually gives up. They

argue that they fear being given 'dirty' looks by other people in the taxis. The following quotation reveals the extent of self monitoring among Zimbabweans.

> "You can't speak Shona in a taxi. It's like a dog barking in a taxi. They will wonder where the dog has come from...you are not welcome. You feel inferior and you cannot answer your phone" (Brian).

3.7. Schools and xenophobia

Among the participants were three parents who complained that their children had experienced xenophobia at school. Vongai had a son who was in a day care centre. She explained how she had an altercation with one of the teachers at the day care centre:

> "I had one nasty experience with his teacher. He has been through three teachers in the three years that he has been in day care. The first two teachers were white and there were no problems. This year his teacher is a black South African woman. She started telling me things I had never known about my child...She said my child was naughty etcetera and I really think that was a xenophobic attack. I ignored it and it just died down.... I could sense that it was because this child is Shona and Zimbabwean. You can feel the vibe that it's not really about the child... it's about the being a child of a foreigner".

Another case was that of William's daughter who was called *makwerekwere* by a fellow classmate at school. The third case was that of Mary's seven year old son who was teased at school by being called Tsvangirai. Tsvangirai is the former Prime Minister of Zimbabwe. The child did not know who Tsvangirai was and came home asking "Mama who is Tsvangirai?" Mary and her husband did not confront the school authorities and preferred to ignore the situation, hoping it would eventually fizzle out. In the two cases of Mary and Vongai, ignoring the situation was felt as a better strategy to avoid the escalation of conflict. There was fear that the child would be further stigmatised. This avoidance could have been a result of the non- existent relationship between the parents of the migrant children and the school authorities. The situation was different from William who was well known by school authorities as a member of the School Governing Body. He easily approached the headmaster and the matter was dealt with. Parental involvement in the affairs of children at school is a form of social capital which helps decrease social exclusion of children of migrants (Turney and Kao 2009).

3.8. Migrant networks as sources of exclusion

Migrant networks functioned to fan social exclusion through making exclusive claims to individual migrants and discouraging their membership and participation in the wider society. This happened through religious groups such as the Seventh Day Adventist (SDA) church which discouraged mixing with locals who were regarded as 'sinners'. Social exclusion was perpetuated by the same religious networks which tended to take the undocumented status of migrants as normal. By not questioning illegality, they helped perpetuate the undocumented status of these members, thus making it difficult for them to access employment and health and exposing them to harassment by the

police. In addition migrants generally did not prefer intermarriages with locals although some men had sexual liaisons with local women.

Another problem was tribalism which seems to have been carried over from Zimbabwe to South Africa. Godfrey had a very strong negative attitude against the Shona. This stemmed from deep feelings of injustice that he felt at his previous employment that was dominated by the Shona. For him the Shona language is a sign of domination. He argues:

> "I hate the Shona language. When I trained at the Zimbabwe Prison Services (ZPS) they discriminated against us and forced us to speak Shona. They addressed us in Shona. The treatment I received was worse than what I experienced in South Africa. Even Ndebeles at ZPS would speak Shona and address us in Shona. They would beat us if we didn't understand. I learnt Shona in three months. It was forced. So I hated it... the recruitment process was also biased. Eighty percent (80%) of recruits were Shona... Ndebeles have always been sidelined... when I grew up I was told about Gukurahundi in rural areas of Matopo and I understood it when I was cruelly treated at work".

An interesting point to note is the continuous tense used by the migrant that 'Ndebeles have always been sidelined'. This means that, for him, the inequality between Ndebele and Shona is a continuous process. Stiff (2002:189) highlights that during the *Gukurahundi* (the mass executions of Ndebele speaking people between 1981 and 1987 whose toll is estimated to be between 16000 and 20000), Ndebele people were forced to dance on the graves of their relatives while singing Shona songs. These relatives were killed by the Shona speaking 5th Brigade.

The feelings of anger against *Gukurahundi* transcend generations among the Ndebele, such that Godfrey (who was born in 1981) evaluates his relations with the Shona from that perspective of anger and sense of injustice.

The same argument was put forward by William who is a fifty four year old Ndebele man. He had problems of accommodation when he came to Johannesburg in 1992. Though he had a Ndebele friend who offered him accommodation, resistance from other Ndebeles made the stay unpleasant and he eventually moved out. He argues:

> "When I came here I first stayed with friends. It was bad. My friend was from Plumtree and had many friends from Plumtree. These friends from Plumtree thought that people from Silobela are not real Ndebele....so they looked down upon me because they said I was related to Shona people even though I am Ndebele. The treatment was bad.....we stayed together for three months and they chased me away".

William's case shows how regionalism combined with tribalism led to his exclusion by other Zimbabweans. Silobela is a rural area in the Midlands province. The Midlands province is populated by a mixture of Ndebele and Shona speaking people. According to Williams' narrative, Ndebele speaking people from Midlands were not deemed as real Ndebele. They were discriminated against by those that called themselves hard-core Ndebele speakers from Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South.

4. Conclusions

The study has shown that being publicly known as a Zimbabwean elicits negatives reactions from locals because the Zimbabwean identity is devalued. It is also clear that social exclusion is about scarce resources (such as jobs and public services) which locals find themselves sharing with migrants (most of whom are undocumented). The negative reaction of most locals must be understood from the perspective of a generally harsh economic environment characterised by recession, job cuts and an unemployment rate of 40%. The media does not help the situation when it constantly bombards the public with stories of 'hoards' or 'floods' of Zimbabweans in the country.

While the main agents of social exclusion were identified as banks, school, hospitals, the police and other government departments, this does not mean that the encounters between Zimbabweans and these institutions were always negative, there were cases of collaboration and friendships that also developed. These created bridging social capital for migrants.

The research also shows that all social classes seem to have problems accessing credit facilities in banks. The most frustrated migrants are the self-employed business owners who cannot expand their businesses because of lack of adequate capital and support from banks. Those who cannot save their money in banks risk being targeted by criminals. It must, however, be acknowledged that some banks are reaching out to migrants through cellular phone transactions where even those without bank accounts can access money if they have cellular phones.

In terms of health facilities, the better off go for private doctors. They avoid government clinics and hospitals. The poor bear the brunt of exclusion and xenophobia since they have no better options than visit the government clinics and hospitals. These are the ones that report more social exclusion in hospitals. However the reaction of hospital staff must also be evaluated from the perspective of stress and burnout. Public hospitals generally tend to be under-staffed and overloaded by work. Therefore the nurses' attitudes could reflect burnout more than social exclusion.

This study notes that habits of secrets and lies are some of the consequences of social exclusion. The tendency to lie is necessitated by the harsh treatment that migrants see being experienced by those who disclose their foreign status. Those that would have started friendships, relationships and marriages based on lies feel motivated to continue lying in order to maintain the relationship. Migrants usually lie about who they are and where they come from. This is especially true for undocumented ones who run the risk of losing jobs, friends and lovers if they reveal their true selves (Sigona 2012). Disclosing who they truly are could lead to the painful end of a cherished relationship. That is why most migrants would rather not have any relationships at all with the locals.

A quarter of the sample participants are now self employed migrants. According to Kloosterman, Van der Leun and Rath (1998:250) the self-employment of migrants results from strict government employment laws and restrictive policies in general. Literature reveals that migrants and ethnic minorities in general are pushed into self-employment due to blocked mobility, discriminatory hiring and rewarding procedures

and non- transferability and non-recognition of educational qualifications (Van Tubergen 2005). Most of these factors are connected to social exclusion.

These findings also reveal that and rejection of new migrants are other consequences of social exclusion. All Zimbabwean migrants maintained that they knew and had seen poor Zimbabweans. In most cases these poor resorted to begging on the streets in order to survive. Poverty meant lacking any of the following: accommodation, food, employment and help from relatives and friends. Migrants were not really inclined to help the poor because they were also hard pressed in terms of money. They therefore preferred to tell the worse-off to go back home. To this end, this research adds to the growing literature on the rejection of migrants by their fellow co-ethnics (Menjivar 1997; Worby 2010). This rejection is connected to harsh economic environments that create a narrow structure of opportunity for migrants. This structure of opportunity encompasses government laws, institutional activities and regulations, employers, other migrants and South African locals. These are all agents of social exclusion.

The findings of this study refute Bonacich's (1973:586) claim that "in the host country ethnic and regional division fade before an overriding 'national' unity). Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) also made a similar argument on bounded solidarity (a type of solidarity born out of common challenges or adversity). This research has revealed that although the Ndebele and Shona Zimbabweans may face the same adversities, this does not necessarily cause them to be united because of deep seated feelings of tribalism and regionalism. This is causing the exclusion of Zimbabweans by other Zimbabweans lending support to Polzer's (2008) claim that Zimbabweans participate in their own exclusion.

The research lends validation to Kabeer's (2000) claim that no-one is completely excluded from society, thus a binary view of social exclusion and social inclusion is problematic. What must be appreciated is that there are different levels of inclusion and exclusion, especially when considering participation in the labour market. Individuals may be employed in unfavourable conditions thus participating on disadvantaged terms.

Finally, the paper outlines the various forms of social exclusion of Zimbabwean migrants in Johannesburg showing how government policies and institutions function to exclude migrants. The use of the concept of social exclusion to understand the situation of migrants allows us to appreciate how government institutions function in a non-neutral manner creating an exclusionary environment. It also reveals how migrants exclude each other and how social networks lead to encapsulation and self exclusion of migrants.

References

Atkinson, AB. 1998. Social exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment, in *Exclusion, Employment and opportunity* edited by AB Atkinson and J Hills. London: London School of Economics: 9-22. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE Paper/4 January 1998).

Barry, B. 1998. *Social exclusion, social isolation and the distribution of income.* London: London School of economics. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, CASE Paper/12 August 1998. [Online] Available online at http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cp/Paper12.pdf (Accessed on 5/6/2011).

Beck, U. 2000. The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity. *British Journal of Sociology, 5*(1), 79-105.

Bonacich, E. 1973. A theory of middleman minorities. *American Sociological Review, 38* (October), 583-594.

Carr, M & Chen, M. 2004. Globalisation, social exclusion and gender. *International Labour Review, 143*(1-2), 129-160.

Cholewinski, R. 2005. *Study on obstacles to effective access of irregular migrants to minimum social rights.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe, F-67075.

Crush, J & Tawodzera, G. 2011. *Medical xenophobia: Zimbabwean access to health services in South Africa.* Cape Town: SAMP and OSISA. Migration Policy Report Number 54.

Daly, M & Silver, H. 2008. Social exclusion and social capital: A comparison and critique. *Theory and society, 37*, 537-566. [Online] Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11186-008-9062-4. (Accessed on 23/11/2011).

Gaidzanwa, RB. 1997. *Voting with their feet: A study of Zimbabwean nurses and doctors who migrated from Zimbabwe at the time of Structural Adjustment.* A paper presented at the Structural Adjustment and Socio-economic Change in Southern Africa Review Seminar. Hotel Ibis- Plateau, Abidjan, 23-25 March. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.

Hungwe, C. 2012. Contagion or calculated rationality? Rethinking crowd behaviour in recent xenophobic outbreaks in South Africa: Explaining the killing of Farai Kujirichita in the Diepsloot Township of Johannesburg, South Africa. *LWATI: A Journal of Contemporary Research 9*(4), 128-142.

Kabeer, N. 2000. Social exclusion, poverty and discrimination: towards an analytical framework. *IDS Bulletin 1*(4), 83-97.

Kalitanyi, V & Visser, K. 2010. African immigrants in South Africa: Job takers or creators. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences New Series, 13*(4), 376-390.

Kloosterman, R, Van der Leun, J & Rath, J. 1998. Across the border: Immigrants' economic opportunities, social capital and informal business activities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 24*(2), 249-268.

Lancee, B. 2012a. The economic returns of bonding and bridging social capital for immigrant men in Germany. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 35*(4), 664-683.

Landau, LB & Freemantle, I. 2010. Tactical cosmopolitanism and idioms of belonging: Insertion and self exclusion in Johannesburg. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36*(3), 375-390.

Lelkes, O. 2006. *Social exclusion in Central-eastern Europe: concept, measurement and policy interventions.* Geneva: ILO Working Paper, Strategies and Tools against Social Exclusion and Poverty (STEP).

Levitas, R, Pantoras, C, Fahmy, E, Gordon, D, Lloyd, E & Patsios D. 2007. *The multi- dimensional analysis of social exclusion.* Bristol: University of Bristol.

Mai, N. 2005. The Albanian diaspora in the making: media, migration and social exclusion. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31*(3), 543-561.

McDowell, MG & Wonders, NA. 2010. Keeping migrants in their place: technologies of control and racialized public space in Arizona. *Social Justice, 36*(2), 54-72.

Menjivar, C. 1997. Immigrant kinship networks and the impact of the receiving context: Salvadorans in San Francisco in the early 1990s. *Social Problems, 44*(1), 104-123.

Monson, T& Misago, JP. 2009. Why history has repeated itself: the security risks of structural xenophobia. *South African Quarterly, 29*(September), 25-35.

Morris, A. 1998. "Our fellow Africans make our lives hell": The lives of Congolese and Nigerians living in Johannesburg. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 21*(6), 1116-1136.

Percy-Smith, J (ed). 2000. *Policy responses to social exclusion towards inclusion?* Buckingham: Oxford University Press.

Polzer, T. 2008. *South African government and civil society responses to Zimbabwean migration.* Cape Town: SAMP. SAMP Policy Brief Number 22. [Online] Available at www.queensu.ca/samp/sampresources/ samppublications/#policyseries (Accessed on 6/12/2011).

Portes, A. & Sensenbrenner, J. 1993. Embeddedness and immigration: notes on the social determinants of economic action. *Journal of Sociology 98*(6), May, 1320-1350.

Reidpath, DD, Chan, KY, Gifford, SM & Allotey, P. 2005. "He had the French pox": stigma, social value and social exclusion. *Sociology of Health and Illness, 27*(4), 468-489.

Room, GJ. 1999. Social exclusion, solidarity and the challenge of globalisation. *International Journal of Social Welfare, 8*(3), 166-174. [Online] Available at http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi.1111/1468-2397.00080 (Accessed on 23/11/2011).

Saith, R. 2001. *Social exclusion: the concept and application to developing countries.* Oxford: Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford. QEH Working Papers Series QEHWP72.

Sen, A. 2000. *Social exclusion: concept, application and scrutiny.* Manila: Asian Development Bank. Social Development Papers Number 1 June 2000.

Sigona, N. 2012. I have too much baggage: the impacts of legal status on the social worlds of irregular migrants. *Social Anthropology, 20*(1), 50-65.

Silver, H. 1994. Social exclusion and social solidarity: three paradigms. *International Labour Review* 133: 531-78.

Silver, H. 1995. Reconceptualising social advantage: three paradigms of social exclusion, in *Social exclusion: rhetoric, reality, responses,* edited by G Rodgers, C Gore & JB Figueiredo. Geneva: ILO: 57-80.

Sinclair, MR. 1999. "I know a place that is softer than this..." emerging migrant communities in South Africa. *International Migration, 37*(2), 465-81.

Stiff, P. 2002. *Cry Zimbabwe.* Alberton: Galago.

Turney, K & Kao, G. 2009. Barriers to school involvement: are migrant parents disadvantaged? *Journal of Educational Research, 102*(4), 257-271.

Van Nieuwenhuyze, I. 2009. *Getting by in Europe's urban labour markets: Senegambian migrants' strategies for survival, documentation and mobility.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Van Tubergen, F. 2005. Self- employment of immigrants: A cross national study of 17 western societies. *Social forces, 84* (2) December 2005, 709-732.

Vigneswaran, D. 2012. Experimental data collection methods and migration governance, in *African Migrations Research*, edited by M Berriane & H De Haas. New Jersey: Africa World Press: 110-133.

Vigneswaran, D, Araia, T, Hoag, C & Tshabalala, X. 2010. Criminality or monopoly? Informal immigration enforcement in South Africa. *Journal of African Studies, 36*(2), June: 465-517.

Worby, E. 2010. Address unknown: the temporality of displacement and the ethics of disconnection among Zimbabwean migrants in Johannesburg. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 36*(2), 417-432. [Online] at http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0357070.2010.485792 accessed December, 7 2011.

Government Acts and Statutes

Broad Based Economic Empowerment Amendment Bill November 2012. [O]. Available at www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=68031 (Accessed 2/12/2012).